UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

United States of America,	Case No. CR 15. +03 +0 MEJ/EDL
Plaintiff, v. (a(M. For Ce	STIPULATED ORDER EXCLUDING TIME UNDER THE SPEEDY TRIAL ACT
Defendant.	FILED
For the reasons stated by the parties on the record on April 29, 2015 the Court excludes time under the Speedy Trial Act from April 29, 2015 to May 29, 2015 and finds that the ends of justice served by the continuance outweigh the best interest of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial. See 18 LEGISTIC COURT (A). The Court makes this finding and bases this continuance on the following factor (5):	
Failure to grant a continuance would be li See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(i).	kely to result in a miscarriage of justice.
The case is so unusual or so complex, due to [check applicable reasons] the number of defendants, the nature of the prosecution, or the existence of novel questions of fact or law, that it is unreasonable to expect adequate preparation for pretrial proceedings or the trial itself within the time limits established by this section. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(ii).	
Failure to grant a continuance would deny the defendant reasonable time to obtain counsel, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).	
Failure to grant a continuance would unreasonably deny the defendant continuity of counsel, given counsel's other scheduled case commitments, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).	
Failure to grant a continuance would unreasonably deny the defendant the reasonable time necessary for effective preparation, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).	
IT IS SO ORDERED.	
DATED: 4 29 15	Elizabeth D. Laporte
	United States Magistrate Judge
STIPULATED: Attorney for Defendant	Assistant United States Attorney
	Richard Evang Trial countel
	Kathryn Haun, AWA
V	William Frentzen Ausa